

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the final Office Action of August 10, 2007 (Office Action), and the subsequent Advisory Action of October 17, 2007. This response is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination and a Petition for One-Month Extension of Time. The Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies in payment to Deposit Account 50-0951.

New Grounds Of Rejection

In the Office Action, new grounds of rejection, noted at page 2 of the Office Action, were stated as the basis of rejection for each of the claims. In particular, Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-20, 22-30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0047550 to Tanada (hereinafter Tanada) in view of U.S. Patent 5,331,434 to Kikinis (hereinafter Kikinis). Claims 10, 21, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanada and Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent 6,121,949 to Ramamurthy (hereinafter Ramamurthy). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanada and Kikinis, in view of U.S. Patent 6,836,260 to Cok (hereinafter Cok). Additionally, an objection to Claim 32 was made at page 2 of the Office Action.

Although Applicants respectfully maintain their disagreement with the previously-stated rejections, Applicants nevertheless have further amended certain claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application by emphasizing certain aspects of the invention. Applicants respectfully note, however, that the amendments are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

In particular, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, and 25 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of any of the claim amendments.

Certain Aspects Of Applicants' Invention

It may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. Amended Claim 1 typifies one embodiment of the invention, which is a self-calibrating imaging display system. The system can include a display having a screen, and a multiple photosensors integrated with the screen. The photosensors can be configured to detect luminance values correlating to distinct luminance levels at different regions of the screen.

The system further can include a display adaptor communicatively linked the display for causing the display to display upon the screen a test pattern. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0018], [0019], and [0027].) The system also can include a calibration module. The calibration module can be configured to directing the display adaptor to generate at least one measurement field comprising a region spanning no more than 10% of the screen. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0027], lines 1-5.) The calibration module also can direct the display adaptor to cause the measurement field to be stepped through a sequence of values from zero and increasing at each step up to a maximum display driving level (DDL). (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0027], lines 5-10.)

The calibration module can be further configured to receive from the photosensors inputs correlating to the luminance values. The calibration module, moreover, can be configured to determine a plurality of luminance correction factors, different ones of the luminance correction factors being applied to different regions of the screen so as to adjust luminance of the screen at the different regions.

The Claims Define Over

Independent Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, and 25, as noted above, were rejected as being unpatentable over Tanada in view of a newly-cited reference, Kikinis. As previously noted, Tanada is directed to a "self light emitting device," which maintains a uniform screen display without "brightness irregularities." (Tanada, paragraph [0027]; see also Abstract, lines 1-4.) A "degradation state" in Tanada is detected independently of electroluminescence degradation. (See Tanada, paragraph [0027], 3-6.)

Applicants respectfully maintain, as previously argued, that Tanada, regardless of any teaching regarding the detection of brightness, does not disclose those features that enable the detection, and adjustment, of inter-regional contrasts. As stated in the Specification, this is a feature that can be critical, for example, in some radiology modalities like mammography and in some cases digital colonoscopy so as to ensure that a display can repeatedly meet a designed calibration specification.

Accordingly, one feature of Applicants' invention not taught or suggested by the combination of Tanada and Kikinis is that of a calibration module which receives from multiple photosensors inputs correlating to luminance values at different regions of a display screen, as recited in each of the independent claims. Nor does the combination teach or suggest a calibration module, which is configured to determine different luminance correction factors. As further recited in the independent claims, such correction factors can be applied to different regions of the screen so as to adjust luminance of the screen at the different regions. Applicants respectfully maintain that these features are not taught or suggested in either reference.

Tanada discloses computing a brightness difference for several grayscales. But a grayscale is not a distinct region of a display, and Tanada does not contemplate dealing differently with distinct regions of a display. It follows that, regardless of Tanada's computing a difference for several grayscales, Tanada discloses nothing pertaining to

different luminance correction factors that are applied to different regions of the screen, as expressly recited in Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, and 25.

Moreover, neither reference teaches or suggests a calibration module that is configured to direct a display adaptor to generate at least one measurement field comprising a region spanning no more than 10% of the screen and cause the measurement field to be stepped through a sequence of values from zero and increasing at each step up to a maximum display driving level (DDL), said calibration module. When more than one such measurement field is used and applied to different regions of the screen, such between-region comparisons and calibrations can be facilitated. Each such region can be spanned by a different measurement field, as also recited in Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, and 25

As previously noted, Kikinis was not cited as teaching or suggesting any aspects of these features, and accordingly, fails to teach or suggest these features. Applicants, therefore, maintain that the combination of Tanada and Kikinis fails to teach or suggest every feature recited in Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, and 25.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims in Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, and 25 each define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that, whereas each of the remaining claims depends from Claim in Claims 1, 13, 15, 23, or 25 while reciting additional features, each of the dependent claims likewise defines over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the

Appln. No. 10/677,970
Amendment dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2007
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0027 (396)

Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Date: December 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Richard A. Hinson", written in dark ink.

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000